



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,650	06/20/2006	Willem Gerard Ophey	FR030164	8815
24737 7590 03/05/2009 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
ORTIZ CRIADO, JORGE L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2627				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/05/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/596,650

Applicant(s)

OPHEY ET AL.

Examiner

JORGE L. ORTIZ CRIADO

Art Unit

2627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ishibashi et al. U.S. Pat. No. 4,761,774.

As per claim 1, Ishibashi et al. discloses an optical pick-up device, comprising: a first part (32); a second part (34/36a-b/37/35) carrying an optical system and being pivotally movable relative to said first part about a first pivot axis (M), said optical system defining a beam path (L) for a laser beam in a generally longitudinal direction along said second part; a laser source (45) located substantially at the point where said first pivot axis (M) and said beam path (L) intersect (See Fig. 1; L intersect with M); wherein said optical system comprises a first folding mirror (reflecting surface of 35; shown under element 38) for folding said beam path by 90 degrees in a first plane which is essentially parallel to said first pivot axis (M), and a second folding mirror (reflecting surface of 35; shown at the intersection point) for folding said beam path by 90 degrees in a second plane which is essentially orthogonal to said first pivot axis (M).

As per claim 2, Ishibashi et al. discloses a polarizing beam splitter adjacent to the laser source for directing light reflected from an information carrier towards an arrangement of photodiodes for read-out (see col. 3 through line 55).

As per claim 5, Ishibashi et al. discloses I wherein the second part is also pivotally movable relative to said first part about a second pivot axis, this second pivot axis intersecting said first pivot axis substantially orthogonally at the point (P) where said first pivot axis and said beam path intersect (see with respect to Figs. 7 and Figs 8a through 8d; where it is described to also pivots orthogonally).

As per claim 6, Ishibashi et al. discloses comprising a collimating lens for collimating the emission from the laser source upon entry into the second part (see col. 3 through line 55).

As per claim 7, Ishibashi et al. discloses wherein the collimating lens and the laser source are positioned such that said lens is within the far field radiation pattern of the laser source at all operational positions of the second part (since adjacent within source 45 at all operations).

Claim 9 is drawn to the optical drive corresponding having the pickup above and is rejected for the same reasons of anticipation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishibashi et al. U.S. Pat. No. 4,761,774.

Although, Ishibashi et al. does not expressly disclose the use of roof-prism or a double roof-prism for splitting said reflected light into two separate beams towards the photodiodes or for splitting said reflected light into four separate beams towards the photodiodes.

These are merely the well known techniques used in the art for focus error detection for instance. The examiner takes Official Notice. One of an ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious to use any of these techniques for their respective beneficial purposes.

Note: Alternatively, Applicant's admits that are well known in his/her own admissions (see section under Background of the Invention section of the specification.).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Closing Comments

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JORGE L. ORTIZ CRIADO whose telephone number is (571)272-7624. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri 10:00 am- 6:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrea L. Wellington can be reached on (571) 272-4483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jorge L Ortiz-Criado/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2627